

Draft Action/Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, May 4, 2010 - 5:30 p.m.

(15 minutes 5:30-5:45 for agenda items 1-4)

- 1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call.**
Chairman Gillon called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners: Chairman Alex Gillon, Vice Chairman John Griffin - arrived at 5:32 p.m., and Commissioners James Eaton, Michael Hadley, Alain Soutenet, and Norm Taylor. Marty Losoff - excused

Staff: Andy Dickey, Beth Escobar, Nick Gioello, John O'Brien, David Peck, Donna Puckett and Ron Ramsey

- 2. Commission/Staff announcements and summary of current events by Chairman/staff.**

John O'Brien announced that the new City Council will be seated on May 25th. Additionally, staff met with Paul Galloway regarding the Piñon Drive and Nirvana Projects and a time extension request is expected on those at the October Commission hearing. We have our first series of public meetings on the Community Plan Update; the first meeting is Monday at 6:00 p.m. at the Red Rock High School, then Tuesday, May 11th at 1:00 p.m. at KSB, and Thursday, May 13th at 6:00 p.m. at St. Andrews Church.

The Chairman asked the Commissioners to state which meetings they plan to attend: Commissioner Taylor - the first and third; Commissioner Soutenet - the 13th; Chairman Gillon - the second meeting; Vice Chairman Griffin - the first meeting; Commissioner Hadley - the first and third; and Commissioner Eaton indicated he is gone next week.

- 3. Approval of minutes for the following meetings: April 20, 2010 (R)**

The Chairman asked if there were any comments or a motion.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Griffin moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Eaton seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. Losoff excused.

- 4. Public Forum – for items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public).**

The Chairman opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

- 5. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING REQUEST(S) THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES: (90 minutes 5:45-7:15)**

A. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for a Conditional Use Permit for the Sedona Community Farmer's Market, an outdoor farmer's market at the Sedona Airport to be held on two days a week during the summer season and one day a week during the winter season. The Farmer's Market has been operating at this location for approximately a year under a Temporary Use Permit. The Farmer's Market has had an average of 35 vendors selling local products and crafts. The subject property is currently

zoned CF (Community Facilities) and is approximately 221 acres. The Farmer's Market is located on an approximately one-acre portion of the site, directly opposite the scenic overlook off of Airport Road. The property is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number: 408-27-001. Applicant: Sedona Community Farmer's Market. Case Number: CUP 2010-01

PRESENTATION, Beth Escobar: Indicated that this request is for a Conditional Use Permit for the Sedona Community Farmer's Market that has been operating on the airport property owned by Yavapai County for approximately one year under a Temporary Use Permit. Beth showed an aerial view of the area and explained that it is located directly across from the scenic overlook, with the front portion used for the parking.

Beth identified the location of the booths and their layout, plus the location of the traffic cones to stop the traffic from going into the U-shaped booth area that usually has music in the center. The proposal is for a seasonal farmer's market that will go year-around. In the summer, it will operate for two days, Fridays and Saturdays, for 4 hours in the morning, from late May to mid-October. In the winter, it will operate on Sundays for four hours either in the mornings or afternoons, depending on the climate from mid-October to early May, and the applicant will notify us of the dates as the events approach.

Beth explained that the booths are rented to vendors and they have to complete an application approved by the Sedona Airport Authority. Taxes are collected on non-food items and that has been verified with the Economic Planner. Local growers are given preference by the Director; however, in the winter when the local growers don't have produce, vendors from the Valley come up to sell produce.

Additionally, the applicant is seeking non-profit status and that affects two things. The City has currently waived the \$1,500 Conditional Use Permit Fee, but if her non-profit status is denied, she will pay that fee within 30 days. The Director is also working with ADOT regarding signage and apparently there are different rules for non-profit entities. The signs currently are sandwich signs placed in the ADOT right-of-way and that has been done since they have been operating; however, in reviewing the Conditional Use Permit, ADOT has stated that those no longer will be permitted and the applicant is appealing that determination. Per our Land Development Code, off-premise signs are prohibited, so the sandwich sign can't be placed on private property; however, during the work session there was a discussion of other ways the City of Sedona could assist in informing the public about the farmer's market, if the Commission wishes to direct staff to pursue that.

Construction, at SR89A and Airport Road, is planned to put in a light and right turn lane, and they have someone who might receive that bid, but it is not formalized yet, so construction is anticipated to start around June or July. The applicant will work with staff and ADOT regarding that construction, and the Director has an email network and can notify customers if the intersection is going to be closed, etc.

Beth then read staff's recommendation for approval of this request and indicated that she has Revised Conditions of Approval. Condition 2 was added; the applicant is requesting a 5-year time period for approval, and this is the standard language. If approved, the Conditional Use Permit would expire May 4, 2015. Additionally, there was a question at the work session regarding animals, and Condition 12 has been refined to say, "Live animals other than domestic pets should be located a minimum of 10 ft. away from any food and produce vendors", and that language has been approved by Yavapai County Health.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF STAFF:

Commissioner Hadley indicated that the City of Sedona Code is under consideration for possible revision and asked if that would have any impact on the signage. John O'Brien explained that the Council directed staff to look at allowing limited off-premise signs for major resorts that don't have highway frontage, so this would not be included in that direction. Council also said if there is another way to deal with the issue, which was precipitated by L'Auberge, by providing an advance directional sign in the right-of-way for L'Auberge Lane, they would prefer that route rather than revising the Sign Code to allow off-premise signs, and staff has figured out a way to do that, so we won't be going through that code amendment.

Commissioner Soutenet asked if that means directional signs could be applied in the case of the farmer's market and John O'Brien explained that was a directional sign for the street, so the only sign would be for Airport Road, and he thinks there already is a sign that says Airport Road. The Commissioner indicated that he would encourage the City to participate in the promotion through its website or any other means, for the market's activities. John O'Brien explained that staff will take that direction, but staff will have to discuss that with the City Manager to figure out if we are setting a precedent for other non-profits that may want to advertise on the City's website as well. It could be opening it up for a number of non-profits that might question why the City doesn't do that for other non-profits. Chairman Gillon asked if it would be appropriate for the Commission to direct staff to do so, if that is the consensus of the Commission, and John O'Brien stated sure.

Chairman Gillon indicated that given there will be construction at Airport Road and there may be a need to use a detour, and considering what we did with the Sign Code during construction on SR 179, would it be appropriate to allow a sandwich board on private property, when there are detours around Airport Road. John O'Brien indicated that is something he would want to get direction on from Council, but we did that for the Uptown Enhancement Project and the SR 179 construction project, so it would be appropriate, because it would be affecting businesses.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked what happened to the City event sign that was in front of Exposures Gallery and John O'Brien indicated he thinks it is in storage, because it wasn't successful. The Vice Chairman expressed that visitors and others not familiar with the town need some way to be introduced to the community, and when the signs were posted at the "Y", it was a great way to let people know what was going on, but when you do off-premise signage, it opens it up and it is hard to be subjective about it, because everyone who is not on the highway would want it. The Chairman noted that it is ironic that the "Tree of Events" didn't work, because the signs at the "Y" certainly worked. The Vice Chairman added that it might not have been the signage as much as the location. John O'Brien explained that at the "Y" traffic was stopped; however, now with the roundabout, it is continuous traffic and it was the same with the "Tree of Events" with traffic driving through.

Commissioner Eaton asked if it requires a code amendment to put up a street directional sign and John O'Brien answered no. The Commissioner then asked if those signs referred to were just business access directional signs that were not specific to any businesses and John O'Brien explained that during the highway construction, businesses were allowed signage in the ADOT right-of-way that named the businesses; however, the Commissioner pointed out they were in front of their own businesses and John O'Brien agreed.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION, Katrin Themlitz, Director of Sedona Farmer's Market, Sedona: Thanked the Planning & Zoning Department, City of Sedona and the Sedona-Oak Creek Airport Authority for supporting the market in its first year. The idea of a

farmer's market was hatched in January of 2009 around conversations of reviving agriculture in this area. At one time, the Verde Valley was known as the "bread basket" of Northern Arizona, and there was talk about bringing the history of Sedona's first settlers into focus once again, but there were doubts even among some of the most seasoned leaders, as to if there were enough growers to get it started and if the community would support it in a consistent manner, and even if they could make it happen.

A year-and-a-half later, she can say with confidence that the market was built and they came, vendors, tourists and locals alike. Looking back, it is powerful to see that she could influence local food pathways by building relationships, and she is grateful for the opportunity and positive response. These relationships have now expanded and are creating the first year-around market in Northern Arizona. The market is quickly becoming a force of its own that is serving and refocusing the community on the issue of a sustainable local food network.

Besides the effort to create celebration with live music for locals, vendors and tourists, the weekly farmer's market activity is planting seeds in the community in the forms of conversations and important questions. The purpose of these questions is to raise interest, awareness and encourage participation in the issues surrounding healthy, nutritious and flavorful local food. Some of the topics and questions are:

- What would a local sustainable food system look like?
- What roll can a local farmer's market play in an agricultural revival of the Verde Valley?
- Can the Verde Valley have a bigger voice on local water issues, if they start growing more local food and utilizing ditch irrigation rights that are senior to SRP?
- Can they grow food locally year-around?

Some local restaurants have shown great interest in participating in this conversation. While the market provides healthy local choices for the public, the market is also embracing members of the community who are low income and food insecure. The market has raised funds for local Meals on Wheels and the Sedona Food Bank, and a market sampler of well-known local musicians was produced, the proceeds of which to continue to benefit local Meals on Wheels and the Sedona Food Bank. This coming fall season, the market will be an official retailer for SNAP, also known as food stamps, and the market will continue to participate, as it did last year, in the U.S. Department of Agriculture's sponsored Farmer's Market Nutrition Programs and WIC, which is designed to give low income women with children access to healthy fruits and vegetables.

Also, the market is structuring a program between the market vendors and the Sedona Food Bank for pick-up of fresh produce at the end of market day, to benefit those in need. She recently learned through the Verde Valley Food Council that a staggering 15% of our population in this valley is food insecure, which means about 11,000 people in our community do not have enough food to eat from week to week. The market intends to collaborate in efforts to address this issue. Last summer, in cooperation with Gardens of Humanity and Yavapai County Agricultural Extension, the market worked to provide gardening education at the event from week to week. Backyard gardeners are also encouraged to participate in the market as vendors, as she considers them to be the backbone of a healthy local food system. Also last summer, the market co-sponsored the movie Food, Inc. at the Sedona Film Festival to a packed audience. The film is designed to bring awareness around questions such as where does our food come from, and the movie documents that 70% of all produce currently available in grocery stores in the U.S. contain some form of genetically-modified material. The film empowers the consumer to make informed choices when purchasing foods and the farmer's

market provides a healthy alternative to the consumer who can directly interact with the grower and get honest answers about how their food is grown.

The market's policy is grounded on a principle that prevents reselling of produce and encourages farmers to bring to market what they grow, without having to compete with produce purchased cheaply in Mexico. It stimulates local production and assures traceability, which is a big problem for some of the larger organic food suppliers and grocery stores.

In general, the location at the airport has been well received by the vendors and locals; it has many positive attributes for the market, such as ample parking and space for vendors to park by their booth, which is important to the growers, plus the great views. The market has been approached by other developers, but parking always seems to be an issue, because they have a large crowd coming to the venue. They have 45 vendors at peak season, so it requires quite an amount of space. The wind on Airport Mesa is an issue, plus some of the dust; if they had set sail last summer, they would be half way around the world by now, but it is not a safety issue to the customers, so they are making the best of it.

Katrin again expressed her thanks for the City's support for the last year and as the event grows, she is dedicated to working closely with the City on any future issue that may arise. Additionally, Katrin clarified that during the summer season, they actually asked for Fridays and Sunday mornings, not Saturdays, and the hours are 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The Sunday venue depends on whether or not she can find enough vendors. Last year, she actually turned local growers away, so there was enough produce, but it will be a shorter peak season for local growers, which is mid-July through mid-September.

The Chairman opened the public comment period at this time and having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

Commissioner Hadley indicated that, in conjunction with the work that is going on in the new Community Plan for the City, he and Commissioner Soutenet are involved in a study team on sustainability and this is a perfect match for that, so he is very much in favor of the application.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated he is also very supportive of this, and at the work session, he mentioned that we do have local growers and it was confirmed by the applicant that they will have a priority, so as long as staff feels that is adequately noted in the presentation . . .; it is not in the Conditions, but in the Letter of Intent, so obviously that will be followed-through.

Chairman Gillon indicated he is very much in favor of this also; it is a great opportunity for Sedona and he hopes it is very successful. The Chairman then asked for a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Eaton moved for approval of CUP2010-1 with conditions revised May 4 and as set forth in the Staff Report. Commissioner Hadley seconded the motion.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if there was something the Commission was going to do about signage and Chairman Gillon suggested the Commission finish with this motion and come back with directions to staff.

VOTE: Motion carried six (6) for and zero (0) opposed. (Losoff excused)

The Chairman asked if it is the consensus of the Commission that we would like for staff to investigate possibilities for using City resources to help notice the farmer's market or if there is any objection to that. Commissioner Eaton indicated that he is not comfortable with too many exceptions to the Sign Code; it could be a slippery slope. You could have a profusion of signs all over town, if we aren't careful, but if there is a way to do this without creating precedence, he would not be opposed to looking at it. Chairman Gillon explained that his understanding of the direction is not that they get around the Sign Code, but look at using City resources, such as the City's website or other possible uses to help, and the same caution should be applied there also. There was no other objection or caution presented.

B. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for Subdivision Preliminary Plat and Development Review for the Centrum and the Villas at Centrum, a mixed-use project combining approximately 11,508 square feet of retail/office space and 8 residential condominiums on 2.23-acres, located at 220 Sunset Drive. The subject property is currently zoned C-1 (General Commercial) and RM-2 (High Density Multi-family Residential). The property is further identified as Assessor's Parcel Number: 408-26-030C. Applicant: Gary Muise/Eagle Cliff Development. Case Numbers: DEV2008-2 & SUB2008-2

PRESENTATION, Nick Gioello: Showed a vicinity map and identified the location of the subject property and the surrounding area. He then provided an overview of the request as presented in the Staff Report prepared for May 4, 2010, and identified the location of existing mature trees and drainage channel on the property. Nick then showed a vision of the proposal from the Preliminary Plat to identify the building locations and noted that the ADA unit has a single-car carport. He also identified the location of the driveway connections to Sunset Drive and the Eagle Cliff development, plus the separate pedestrian connection to Eagle Cliff, as well as various sidewalks and an ADA route into the project from the right-of-way on Sunset Drive.

Nick showed how the drainage channel is culverted now, and then empties into the riprap area to slow the velocity down. He also pointed out the driveway for the Casitas Tranquil development to the south. Some site views of the project with landscaping were shown, which demonstrated how the landscaping would soften the look of the buildings, in addition to various site sections showing the project from various views.

Nick indicated that the applicant had provided new drawings with new color elevations and that staff had asked the applicant to provide something to show a person's view from Casitas Tranquil to the proposed buildings, and sketches of those view lines were shown. Nick also showed a slide of the subject property taken about two years ago, that showed the wash and the proximity of Casitas Tranquil unit #1 and two other units to the proposed units. Nick noted that the owner of Unit #1 was present and would probably address the Commission.

Nick then referenced a question asked about Alternate Standards in the work session and explained that two building would be applying Alternate Standards. The two residential units in the middle of the project were shown and Nick explained that the applicant had to apply Alternate Standards, because of the drainage channel in that area. The culverts go in, and then the area will be filled and the building is proposed over that area; however, the Height Code requires that you measure from natural grade before grading, so you have to add that additional portion as part of the overall height, which requires the application of Alternate Standards and the pitched roof exception to the code. Once that area is filled in, the building will look like a 22 ft. tall building.

Regarding the architecture, the applicant is proposing the use of traditional southwest territorial design with the typical materials, such as stucco, native stone, columns with bases, flat and pitched roofs, wood posts, vigas, wainscot, wood overhangs above windows, inset wood window headers and pop-out window sills on the bottom.

Nick showed some of the new color elevations and identified the view from Casitas Tranquil and Sunset Drive. He also noted the stone that was added to most of the buildings since the work session. Nick also explained that the majority of the wash will be culverted and empty into a riprap area in the southeast portion of the property, with onsite retention in that same area, and the applicant's engineer has stated that offsite flows would likely be improved from the current conditions.

Andy Dickey explained that staff reviewed the drainage report for this project and the code requirements have been met; furthermore, due to the hydrologic characteristics of the onsite basin, in relation to the offsite basin that passes through this property, detention was not allowed. There is retention on this project to avoid the increase in flow that would occur if the onsite peak flow were delayed and caused to coincide with the peak flow from the offsite basin. The onsite basin pre-development peak flow was about 4.7 as calculated by the consulting engineer. The post-development peak flow was 4.1, so it has been reduced through retention onsite. The peak flow of the offsite basin is approximately 1,000 cfs, so the relative difference between the two is very great, and that is some of the characteristics that are specific to this site. For clarification, he wanted to explain the difference between detention and retention; detention is the capture of flow and the slow release of flow over time, whereas, retention is the capture of flow with no release. The flows either percolate into the ground or evaporate.

Nick pointed out a mistake in his slide that said "detention" instead of "retention", and indicated that in looking at the Development Review aspect of the project, staff believes it meets or exceeds all of the Land Development Code requirements, the vehicular and pedestrian access meets all requirements of the Land Development Code, and the architectural style is consistent with the Design Review Manual. It also meets or exceeds the Land Development Code requirements for height, massing, color and landscaping, and it meets the Sedona design principles listed in the Design Review Manual. In looking at the application for the subdivision regulations, the design conforms to the goals of the Community Plan, and staff has determined that it is not detrimental to public health or safety and it is consistent with the zoning districts and design standards of the Subdivision Regulations in the Land Development Code, so staff's recommendation is approval with conditions. Nick then read the recommendation as presented in the Staff Report prepared for May 4, 2010.

The Chairman asked about the additional pictures that were presented to the Commission this evening, and Nick explained that today, he met on site with Marge Courtney, the owner of Casitas Tranquil unit #1, to discuss the approximate location of the 6 units in Building D, in relation to her unit and the impact to her view, and she asked that those photos to be given to the Commission. Four of the pictures depict the damage from the flood last September and another picture shows the current view of Coffee Pot Rock from the front of her unit and the site of the proposed units, which in his opinion will remove that view. He also pointed out a metal cage in one picture that is the pump and indicated that Marge asked if that could be spruced up. Arizona Water indicated they could do something to make it look a little nicer, as a separate issue.

Regarding the views, Nick indicated that given where these buildings are, in relation to the topography, even if a single-story unit of about 12 ft. was built, it would still block the view for unit #1, because that unit is cut down into the ground lower than the property to the north. Additionally, the applicant initially proposed the majority of the residential in the preserved area, and staff stated that area needed to be saved for the mature trees, which forced the development to the current proposed location, so that was based on direction from staff. Unit #2 will probably lose all or most of its view as well, given the same issue of being at a lower elevation. There is also another unit that has a view up the channel and the two-story residential building might impact that unit's view, because of the elevation change, and that is over 170 ft. away. Staff doesn't know of a way to preserve those views, other than not building.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF STAFF:

Commissioner Soutenet referenced the water company's pump and indicated that from the picture it appears that there would be several feet in width to accommodate some pedestrian passage, especially if they relocated the fencing; however, Nick explained it is a couple of feet,

but probably wouldn't be wide enough for a sidewalk in that area, and there is also a large metal insert in the ground with a cover, and a dip and culvert going under that driveway.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that when retention is used or the drainage on a property is engineered, we usually end up with a better situation than what the existing vacant land creates. He then asked if that is correct in this case. David Peck explained that the existing floodplain in that area is fairly wide and this will narrow it down to confine it within the pipes, and once the water exits the pipes, it will go through a plunge basin, which is 15 ft. long and 2 ft. deep, and then it will go onto a pad where it will go 50 ft. with no slope, so it will slow the water to the original characteristics, before it gets to the neighboring property to the south, to those two 48 in. pipes.

Commissioner Hadley indicated that Alternate Standards is being applied, because Building E is in the natural grade, so he assumes it goes to 27 ft., but are the standards applied to all buildings, like the colors. Nick indicated there is a consistent color key being applied to all buildings. The Commissioner then indicated that regarding the drainage, as he understands it, the velocity of the water being discharged at the south end would be equal to or less than existing, and he asked if any of the improvements on the site, such as the pervious paving is going to help. David explained that the off-flow from the site in a 100-year event was roughly 4.6 cfs and the improvements will increase to about 11cfs, but they counteracted that with retention to drop it below that to about 4.1 cfs, with the added retention. The Commissioner then indicated it should be better and David confirmed that it needs to be better or the same.

Chairman Gillon asked if, when Alternate Standards are applied in a project, it is by building or the entire project and John O'Brien explained it is by building, but their color palette is consistent. Vice Chairman Griffin asked what happens if they use massing requirements on that, and John O'Brien explained that it is only the building in question. If they have to apply Alternate Standards to a building, they just have to address that building, whether it is with color, massing or a combination. The other buildings don't have to apply Alternate Standards, but in this case the color palette is going to be uniform. The Chairman pointed out that in the future, we could have a development use Alternate Standards on one building and paint that building darker.

APPLICANT'S PRESENTATION, Krista Cline, SEC, Sedona: Introduced the design team members present and showed a rendered version of the architectural elevations, as they were presented in the work session, and then showed the version provided tonight and indicated that they added over 2,000 sq. ft. of stone for a total of approximately 3,200 sq. ft. of stone throughout the project. She then identified the additional stone proposed on the elevations of Buildings A, B, C and E. Considering the economics of stone and not being able to predict construction costs, Krista indicated that it might be more economic to do a high-quality faux alternate and Eagle Cliff has maintained high-quality materials throughout their development. She noted that this has been is a local developer for decades that has made a commitment to maintaining that quality, and from an architectural standpoint, they have met the Commission's concerns regarding the use of stone throughout the entire project.

Krista stated that another primary question was regarding the viewshed, and they have provided a copy of the Viewshed Analysis provided by Eric Seitz. She identified the location that would be equivalent to Unit #1 and indicated that the key thing to remember is that the proposed two-story Building D is sunken 7 ft. to 8 ft., so it is the approximate sightline of a single-story building at grade. Krista then showed a picture taken from the middle of the driveway just north of units 1 and 2, looking through the site, and indicated that they agree that the view will be blocked by the proposed development, but a single-story would block that view anyway. The existing landscaping shown is approximately 4½ ft. tall and the existing site condition, plus how Casitas Tranquil was built lower, creates that resulting condition. In trying to mitigate the impact, they have been through the site planning multiple times. She showed the original proposal presented and explained that in trying to retain the mature vegetation on the site, that proposed area was eliminated as a development option, which created pressure to maintain those units in the current location proposed, and they meet or exceed the setbacks; then, it became a question of how to mitigate that impact.

This project has gone through an extensive design process; there have been multiple options pursued and revised based on staff's comments and other concerns, so they feel that the site plan presented today is the best design solution for this property. Looking at Building D elevations, the hatched areas shown are visual indicators of how far down the building goes within the grade changes of the site, to reduce the height as much as possible and break up the building mass, so there isn't a two-story impact. Additionally, the units step down in elevation toward the drainage area on the southern boundary, so architecturally with the massing, step-downs in association with the grading reduction have been how they have tried to reduce the effects as much as possible. Krista then showed a rendering of the street view of the most westerly unit of Building D, to demonstrate how much the building mass had been reduced.

Krista indicated that they have also incorporated quite a bit of landscaping between the building and the driveway, and the majority is an evergreen landscape. All of the landscaping has been removed from the elevations the Commission has, so the buildings would be visible; however, the landscaping for the site is fairly heavy overall and it meets or exceeds code requirements, especially in that area. The landscape plan also greatly exceeds code along Sunset Drive, to reduce the visual impact of the parking and acts as an additional buffer. In the work session, one suggestion was to include a couple of evergreens in that area, and the Landscape Architect is perfectly willing to make that revision.

Krista then referenced the ADA sidewalk and explained that it had been staff's determination that if a sidewalk connects to a public sidewalk, it needs to be ADA accessible, and that is what the ramping indicates. It was placed there, because they couldn't make the grades with the building work in a different area, but they will continue with an ADA connection into the site through a continued ADA pathway. A slide of the proposed landscape palette was shown and Krista indicated it is very typical of Sedona landscape palettes, so it should do quite well, especially with the number of plants proposed.

Krista then wanted to review some of the elements incorporated into the design of the site and indicated that infill projects are complicated, because not only do you have the standard codes and ordinances to follow, but you also have the Design Review Manual and existing site constraints. This site is built on every side with existing elevations, drainage, viewsheds, etc., in addition to the existing site constraint that impacts the design, and that is the drainage in the area. On the north and south property lines, there are existing perimeter culverts, so there are both upstream and downstream drainages in a controlled situation, and the project site is the only portion that is uncontrolled, and those culverts limit the drainage design options available and that has significantly impacted the finalized site plan.

Therefore, they are proposing the three culvert pipes into the plunge pool, which brings an uncontrolled situation into a controlled scenario, and with the plunge pool, they have used those to increase the open space and reduce the massing along the southern property line. There had been some questions about how a plunge pool functions, and essentially, the culvert would come into the rock basin over riprap that slows the water down, and this a system that is installed locally as well, and their basin would be larger, plus they would have the preserved mature trees around the basin.

Additionally, they have used the permeable pavers recommended throughout the site as an architectural feature, so they are also being used as a visual demarcation for the ADA crossings throughout the site, which adds an architectural theme. One of the biggest elements of the site plan is that the proposed lot coverage is 21%, with an allowed lot coverage of 25%, and that difference is the equivalent of another building that they are not doing, so especially in that southern corner, they are foregoing that for more open space.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS OF THE APPLICANT:

Commissioner Taylor indicated that he is disappointed that there isn't a separate access for housing; those people will have to enter through a commercial area and that puts him off a little. Additionally, he knows other Commissioners have talked about increasing the use of stone, but he doesn't like to see wallpapered buildings, and he doesn't see pasting 1 in. or 2 in. thick stone to the face of a building, just to put stone on it, as the best kind of architecture. He

would rather have seen thicker walls for a bigger reveal or do something around the windows to suggest thicker walls, because stucco has an historic place in this area, so fully-stuccoed buildings doesn't bother him, but it was the thinness with the windows, by having the windows out toward the face of the stucco that cheapens the building, so he would have preferred to see something to make the walls appear thicker instead of the stone.

Commissioner Taylor then referenced the ditch that slows the water and indicated that he didn't realize big stones were being used. He thought it was a concrete basin and the water would pour into the basin, come to some stoppage, and then assume its direction out at a slower speed. The Commissioner asked if that would induce the catching of sand, because when you have stones in that basin and slow the water that is probably carrying a fair amount of sand from the mountains, won't that start to fill it up and create a maintenance problem? If it isn't maintained, the people downstream could be in for a real shock. David Peck explained that on the one hand, we need to slow the water before it gets to the neighboring property, and when the water slows, the silts do drop out, so it would be a maintenance issue for the property owner to maintain it after events that silt-up the basin. The Commissioner indicated that it sounds like the people downstream better keep an eye on that basin; in his efforts to retain water coming off of the forest land at his house, his carefully built dams were silted after one or two rains. John O'Brien pointed out that drainage, and the minutia of drainage on this project, has been discussed for he doesn't know how many reviews, and the City's Engineering Department has reviewed the drainage study and approved it. It meets our codes, reduces the flows off of the site, and we have really beat this to death, so it is time to move on past drainage, because it really isn't the Commission's role to get into that level of detail; you have the professional engineering staff doing a professional engineer's drainage study.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked about the location of the APS meters, because he doesn't want them mounted on the front of the buildings, and when they do that, there is a requirement to keep them open from landscaping so they can be read by APS. This project has more room than Eagle Cliff to set up more appropriate places, but he would like to have that addressed. Additionally, he agrees with Commissioner Taylor on the stone issue; he doesn't like just sticking stone around, and then with the mention of faux possibly, he would rather have less stone instead of faux stone, which we have discouraged in the past. A properly done stucco building obviously has a place, and there can be some stone elements, but he is not excited about just adding a bunch here and there, so he would like for that to be reconsidered.

Additionally, regarding the different types of plants and trees, he wanted to understand that more, because it was mentioned that there is a majority of evergreen plants on this property, but when he looks at the numbers and types listed, such as 14 Arizona Cypress, 16 Piñons, 26 Rayber Ash and Sunburst Locust, plus 10 Desert Willows, he never considered a Crepe Myrtle a tree. Krista clarified that in that landscape area specifically between Building D and Casitas Tranquil, there are several evergreen trees. The Vice Chairman explained his concern was the exposure of Building D from the street and Krista repeated that the Landscape Architect would include additional evergreen trees between Building D and Sunset Drive. The Vice Chairman pointed out that the plan shows tall trees, but the symbol indicates they are Crepe Myrtles, which are bushes. It is nice to draw 15 ft. trees, but they start out as small bushes, so that is a concern, possibly we just turn that over to staff. He understands you are dealing with the old Landscape Plan and regulations, but he wants to have at least some of the trees from other areas, because there are groups of four or five trees, and then a building with Crepe Myrtles in front of it, so he wants things rearranged a little, perhaps with the revised Landscape Plan at least going through staff, so we get year-around screening to soften some of the buildings. The Sunset Mobile Home Park across the way should have a nice landscape palette, as well as Casitas Tranquil, with more evergreens in key places. Chairman Gillon asked if staff could write a Condition for that; we are expecting an updated Landscaping Plan from the applicant.

Krista indicated that the Landscape Architect is not only willing to add additional evergreens along the Sunset Drive frontage, but to also move some of the significant vegetation that is going to be relocated upfront as well, and he has included a notation about trying to address the sizing of plants discussed in the new Landscape Ordinance. Chairman Gillon repeated that the Commission will expect an updated Landscape Plan and will expect a condition that says that

staff will review that; Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that would be acceptable. The Vice Chairman then asked that something also be included to address the APS meters; however, Nick explained that the meter locations were shown on the Grading and Drainage Plan, but the issue will be if APS will approve those locations. Most of the buildings are not along Sunset Drive. Building C is really the only one visible from Sunset Drive, and we can make the argument that they have to go interior to see the others, so those should also be interior. Chairman Gillon indicated that Commissioner Soutenet just checked and they all appear to be interior to the property. The Vice Chairman explained that he just wants to ensure that we don't run into that situation again, and he will be bringing that up with every project; you can talk with APS ahead of time to get something appropriate designed.

Commissioner Hadley asked if the Landscape Architect has reviewed the new Landscape Ordinance and is trying to incorporate that. Krista indicated she isn't sure that the Landscape Architect has had the text in hand, but he understands several of the changes and is trying to comply within the work that has already been done. The Commissioner then wanted to echo Vice Chairman Griffin's concern for more evergreens along Sunset and have that in a condition.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that we have been through a number of sessions on these buildings, and at each one, we have asked for a little more stone to relieve the monotony of plain stucco, and they finally listened to us and struggled forth with what we have, with a little stone pasted here and there that doesn't look functional. He is afraid we got what we asked for, and it didn't result in some really attractive buildings. The first time, they had some really skillful renderings that made anything look great; now, he sees what appear to be too many flat roofs. They are relieved and stepped up and down, and there are things stepped in and out, but he doesn't really know what to say after all of this time.

Chairman Gillon thanked the applicant for providing the Viewshed Analysis and pointed out to the applicant and staff that it would have been easy to put a sightline for where Coffee Pot Rock is, because it would have been easier to see what is happening to the views, so maybe in the future, we could see what the view is of the people we are looking at and put a sightline on it.

Krista added that there had been mention of other connections within the site, and unfortunately, that wasn't possible. The two potential access locations were directly in front of Building D to Sunset, and that grade is about 7 ft. lower and that won't work with engineering rules. The other connection discussed was the potential connection east of Building A to the culverted crossing up above, and there are several issues with that, including that the crossing is owned by the church and they control access to that, plus there are significant hydrologic issues with a connection there, so the existing constraints have affected the site design layout. Architecturally, the inclusion of stone from the previous comments was based on their understanding that the Commission was looking for the addition of stone, and they tried to do that. On the north elevation of Building A, the stone wainscot is in a recessed plane and on Building B, there again is a recessed area on the east that is in stone, lending a visual indication that there is a reason for the stone to be there, and again, they had attempted to do what they understood was the Commission's direction.

The Chairman opened the public comment period at this time.

Margaret Courtney, Sedona, AZ: Indicated she owns unit 1 in Casitas Tranquil and she opposes this project. Everything was covered very well, but she will lose her view, and maybe everyone is tired of the water issue and drainage, but to her that is the biggest thing, and those rock things shown feed right into where they had all of their flooding last winter. She wishes there were some sort of guarantee that the company would make to ensure they are cleaned. If we see they are not cleaned, they aren't going to do anything about it probably, so she wishes there was some guarantee that that wouldn't happen. She has had her condo for 12 years, and they have never had the flooding or damage they had this last winter.

Having no other requests to speak, the Chairman closed the public comment period.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

Nick Gioello indicated that he would like to propose a revision to Condition 5.J, which deals with a detailed landscape plan. Staff is proposing that at the end of the last sentence, where it says, "... said plants shall substantially reflect the intent of the preliminary landscape plan, as approved by the Planning & Zoning Commission," and then add, "with the following modifications of increased quantities of evergreen trees in key locations for building screening and along the street frontage, per the satisfaction of the Director." Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that sounded good.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that he agreed 100% with Director O'Brien that we discussed drainage far beyond our expertise level, and he feels the same about landscaping. He doesn't know where to go with this. Frankly, he doesn't care much for this development, but he doesn't see a way to make it better. The interior circulation is going to be unfortunate. We have discussed that at long length and none of us has gotten a better idea, and we have added and subtracted stone and colors. He is not going to make a motion on this, but he will probably vote with the majority.

Commissioner Hadley agreed with Commissioner Eaton; some things have happened in the course of things and since he has seen it, he has noted some improvement. The buildings are better now than they were a couple of months ago; the stone may appear to be pasted on, but there are elements that have been added to the architecture, which he applauds. The additional vigas, window treatments and small roof overhangs are all very positive. He does have a question about whether or not faux stone is allowed in the code. John O'Brien explained that it is not addressed in the Land Development Code, but it is addressed in the Design Review Manual and it is discouraged. We have allowed it in some limited locations, but it is discouraged and he would ask that whatever the Commission decides, be really clear on whether it is to be all real stone or you are okay with the use of some faux stone, so the applicant knows, when they come in with their construction drawings, that we will expect what the Commission approves.

Chairman Gillon pointed out that the Commission approves this under the condition that the built product is not substantially different than the design, and the design shows real stone, and that would be a substantial difference in his mind, so the default answer is, it has to be real stone. John O'Brien indicated that he agreed that if faux stone came forward, staff would bring that back to the Planning Commission for review. Commissioner Hadley indicated that also satisfies his concern about the stone.

Vice Chairman Griffin referenced the stonework they had before and indicated that he thought we had gotten close to what we wanted with the wider piers underneath that one suspended upper building, and the wainscot walls were thickened, so we felt those walls had some dimension to them, and he would like to just see the stonework shown on the previous elevations, and make sure it is all real stone, instead of pushing them to do more, and then consider faux, which he wouldn't want to consider.

Additionally, the Vice Chairman indicated that in addressing the view corridors, it is a tough situation. It is very difficult for any developer to have an existing building with a view corridor at ground level that goes through the property to be developed, and make it a consideration that the view has to be maintained. It isn't really fair to the person developing their property. There is open space to the east and some views there, but a design with a window facing the middle of a neighboring lot is impossible to save as a view corridor, and it wasn't really the intent that no matter how people designed their homes, they should have that view maintained. With some landscaping, the applicant has done a good enough job, so he won't have an issue with that, but the stone should be real and he is for going back to what they had originally, and the landscaping amendment is fine with him.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that this project was started in the fall of 2007 and it has gone through its process, and he only joined the Commission several months ago, so he is at a little disadvantage in making a judgment, but from the start, he has felt uncomfortable with the fact that everyone has put in a lot of effort and has probably come with the best possible solution,

considering the given, and at the end of the day, it is unfortunate that the land is not really suitable for the type of development that is being applied, and even though it does meet the code requirements, Section 401.06C of the Land Development Code states, "The degree to which the proposed development integrates the proposed built environment", and he thinks it is failing in that, ". . . into the natural environment with minimal disturbance to view corridors, existing native vegetation and established landscaping, the natural topography of the site, natural drainage ways, known wildlife habitat, etc." On that point alone, he would think that the development is failing to meet those criteria, but he was not part of the discussion and process for most of the time, and he doesn't feel it is his position to put the effort that has been put into the project into question at this point; however, from his point-of-view, he doesn't feel comfortable in that the land is not suitable for the development or the development is not adapted to the land.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that he appreciated the response as to why that parking lot couldn't be connected to the road at the northeast corner of the property. He could visualize the cost implications, but he didn't know that there was property ownership issue.

Chairman Gillon agreed with Commissioner Hadley that he has seen a good deal of improvement over the course of time we have been looking at it, but he agrees with Vice Chairman Griffin that this is a property that just doesn't allow view corridors to be maintained under this set of circumstances; they have done what they can. This is not what any of us would think of as an ideal project, but he doesn't see any issues that would justify him not approving it, so he will probably vote for it.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that all of the problems with this property have not been created by the applicant; they have been created by the terrain and its location in the heart of Sedona's primary business district, where we like to have residential and commercial uses mixed. Due to the cost of land, it is necessary to maximize what you can do with it. This is a difficult location and he thinks the applicant has done a good job and tried their best to be responsive to everybody's concerns. When you have property next to private property, you can expect that sooner or later it is going to be built on, and he doesn't know that anything could have been done to maintain the view from one person's window.

Commissioner Hadley suggested adding another condition about the architecture that the design of the buildings stay as presented today, with the additional elements added, with the exception that the stone could be reduced to no less than the previous proposal, so we keep the good stuff, but we have a minimum amount of stone, as shown on the prior submission. Vice Chairman Griffin indicated he would support that. John O'Brien indicated that in the motion, you could refer to what was reviewed at the work session on April 29th. Commissioner Eaton indicated the date of the drawings was April 21st. Chairman Gillon asked if there was any objection to that condition and no objection was expressed. Nick added that the only change to those elevations was the stone, so if we go back to the previous ones, the only difference was the additional stone. Commissioner Hadley indicated if what we are seeing tonight was presented April 21st, with the exception of the stone, it is fine. Commissioner Eaton added that we are requiring natural stone and Chairman Gillon stated yes, the applicant presented natural stone and they have to substantially meet what was presented, so that is a given.

MOTION: Vice Chairman Griffin moved to recommend approval of case number SUB2008-2, and move for approval of case number DEV2008-2, based on compliance with Land Development Code requirements, Development Review criteria, compliance with subdivision regulations and consistency and conformity with the Community Plan and Design Review Manual, subject to applicable ordinance requirements and conditions outlined in the Staff Report, and also the Condition 5.J and using the elevation drawings that were dated April 21st, and that no faux stone will be allowed. Commissioner Hadley seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried five (5) for, zero (0) opposed and one (1) abstention. (Soutenet abstained, Losoff excused)

The Chairman recessed the meeting at 7:27 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

6. Presentation/Discussion regarding Northern Arizona University student project (45 minutes 7:15 – 8:00)

John O'Brien explained that this is a planning step with the Public Planning Program at NAU, and they have looked at the Preserve at Oak Creek Project. Staff met with them, discussed the City ordinances, Design Review Manual and Main Street Guidelines, and he and Nick walked the site with them and identified the issues that they needed to be aware of, when they came back with a conceptual site plan and Letter of Intent for the Commission's review. They have only had four weeks to do this and they are not architecture students; it is site planning, public planning with a project description. The City has worked with Dr. Carolyn Daugherty for at least 15 years, from the NAU Public Planning Program. She has provided interns to the Community Development Department and we have worked with several of her classes on various projects. It has been a great relationship, and she is retiring after this year, so this is her final class that will be presenting to the Commission. It gives the students a lot of hands-on experience by being able to present to the Commission and getting grilled on questions from the Commission. Although she is retiring after this year, she is a Sedona resident, so he will be coercing her to apply for the Planning Commission at some point in the future.

At this point, the presentation was turned over to the NAU students. Those present from NAU were Mike Dalmolin, James Gardner, Matt Henderson, Brandon Herman, Brennan McInnis, James Melnick and Dr. Carolyn Daugherty.

Brandon Herman thanked the Commission for taking time to better their education, with special thanks to John and Nick for guidance on this project. Brandon indicated the name of the project is "The Sycamore Preserve at Oak Creek" and within the documents created, they have complied with the Main Street Design Guidelines, the Sedona Land Development Code, Public Art, and Off-site Affordable Housing requirements.

From an aerial view, Brandon identified the locations of the parcels, which included both sides of the highway, and indicated that they are currently zoned for Planned Development. On a Building Envelope Map, Brandon indicated the bottom area (close to the creek) is a preserve, because this corridor is so pristine with mature Arizona Sycamores, they wanted to keep it. Also, the return on developing the hillside parcel probably wouldn't be great enough to actually develop it, so they left it, and with that in mind, they wanted to make sure that they developed the remaining parcel to a 3-level max to make up for the footprint loss in the other area, a 2-level max, and a 1-level max for the building envelope, so they don't obstruct any views from the road. They also created a roundabout to redirect traffic from and back into the Uptown area, plus a second entrance.

Brandon then showed their basic conceptual design plan and indicated that after studying the demographics in the area, basically, couples 35 and older, middle to upper-middle income brackets, and this being the north end of the Uptown area, they wanted to extend the tourist experience, so they provided a mixed retail and two lodging options. They kept the preserve with meandering pedestrian corridors as an extension of the Oak Creek pedestrian pathway, so this would be the northernmost extension and this is all public, in addition to the lookout, to preserve the viewshed of Oak Creek. Another point would be that the Jordan Wellhouse, an historic site, would have a pathway to the site and an observation area, plus perhaps a plaque to commemorate the significance of the area.

Regarding landscaping easements, they wanted to preserve as many of the mature trees on site as they could, and they recommended that any landscaping be complete xeriscape, all native plant

species, which creates ideal conditions for water conservation. The two onsite parking areas were identified and Brandon noted that the code called for 177 parking spaces and they provided 180.

Brennan McInnis explained that she wanted to go into more detail about the design and aesthetics of the buildings. They wanted to keep the buildings simple with simple architectural details; they used the territorial style in conjunction with the design guidelines, as their inspiration throughout the project. They selected six colors for throughout the project; however, no more than three colors would be used on each building. The colors were selected, because they comply with Section 904 of the Land Development Code and they blend nicely with the natural surroundings. They incorporated several different key building details, such as extended rafter tails, and a few examples were shown. They also incorporated vigas into the design and used different details to tie back to the territorial style, which created another level of interest to the buildings, as well as dimension. They used several different natural materials to enhance these buildings, such as heavy timber to define floor levels and windows, and they will help accentuate the entranceways of different buildings and storefronts. Brennan then showed examples of river rock and red rock that would be two other natural materials seen on almost all of the buildings.

They have three elevations; one is for a restaurant space that is a single-story with the potential of maybe a rooftop dining area. The next depicts the commercial retail space; there would be several buildings that follow this look. The ground level would be strictly retail and the second level would be potentially a mixture of office space, retail space or even restaurant space. The final elevation shows the largest building, which is the 3-story lodging unit. This building has the lobby in the front and above the lobby on the second level would be reception or conference space. The two buildings set behind that would be the three stories of accommodations. The two buildings together would have 84 of the proposed 125 lodging units.

Mike Dalmolin indicated that as new residents to Sedona, they feel a responsibility to help conserve Arizona's most precious resource -- water, so they are doing two things to help conserve potable water. First, they are going to harvest rainwater, so any rain, especially during Monsoons, would be captured by pipes and taken down into a cistern for later use on the landscape. They will meet LEED standards to get LEED credits by saving 50% of their water used that will be harvested water, so they will be saving Sedona's potable water. The other way they are going to save potable water is to install separate plumbing to capture grey water, which is basically anything that comes from showers, bathroom sinks, etc., and all of that will be taken to a separate filtration system, and later used on the landscape to conserve water, and this will meet another standard, by saving 50% of sewage water. They also wanted to provide an educational experience to visitors, this is a very touristy area, and they included signs that discuss how they harvested water and the benefits of that, and how it saves the precious resources, plus they wanted to include contractor information for the residents of Sedona, so they could contact the contractor and learn how to do that. It is their responsibility, as developers, to be more sustainable.

COMMISSION'S QUESTIONS:

Commissioner Eaton indicated he was impressed with the work; it looks like a very logical layout. The most intensive and highest building is down where it doesn't impact the views either from the highway or from neighboring places. The lodging is logically laid out too, so while the others are speaking, he is going to be trying to find something wrong with it.

Commissioner Hadley applauded the sustainability ideas; the rainwater harvesting's time has come, and he working on a project in Santa Fe, New Mexico that mandates that be done. He is hoping our City considers that in the near future, and he thinks that is great and the overall project looks very nice. Good job.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that if you think we spent a long time on the last project, the Preserve at Oak Creek, which was the Cliffs, etc., was one of the first projects that we looked at when he came on the Commission 15 years ago, so there have been a lot of renditions. Economics always plays into this, but the preservation of the area by the creek and the Sycamores is something that is difficult to overlook as a natural wonder and beauty of Sedona, and you need to save and preserve the things that make you special. The Oak Creek and red rocks are two of the important things, so he applauds you, and hopefully, you will maintain that integrity as you enter into your professional lives. Good job, but that is one thing he really applauds you for, in addition to the sustainability of water.

Commissioner Soutenet asked what the logic was for having the parking for the lodging between the preserve area and the building, and Brandon Herman explained that they tried to fit the lodging building within an area that didn't have any Sycamore trees, so that was the only space left to place the parking. It was sort of a last resort situation, but certainly something that is not concrete and could be moved, so people could look out onto the preserve. The Commissioner pointed out that they only talked about sustainability in terms of water and asked if they looked at other sustainable principles to apply to the development. Mike Dalmolin explained that they only had 4 weeks, but if he had his way, they would meet a lot of the LEED standards, as far as energy and water. And, if it was possible, he would have a garden there to grow food, which could be a community thing as well, but they didn't have a lot of time to include all of that. He would look to meet a lot of LEED standards and get it certified. The Commissioner indicated it was a great job.

Commissioner Taylor asked about their program and what they are heading for as a career. Brandon stated environmental planning, public planning and city planning. The Commissioner indicated that as a project, it may have been more interesting to try to tackle how this use of the land would connect to the Uptown area. It is kind of dangling on the end and the retailers at that end have a tough time, because people don't want to walk that far. You do have parking, so people can drive in, but it is really a walking area, so it would be more interesting to try to focus on how this would work and less on the architecture. It seemed that you got a little too deep into the architecture, and if that is your interest, there are other programs, but if you are into planning, it would be more interesting to see how that piece of land with retail could be firmly connected. There is potential for some really interesting projects in Uptown Sedona, which could really put you to the test. He doesn't know how to connect that to the town, but to dangle something else on the end of the town is questionable as to if it would work. Housing would certainly work and a hotel, timeshare or something, but retail, unless the hotel itself could support the retail, might not work. Brandon referenced the third slide and explained that they had the trolley route ending right there at the top of Art Barn Road, but they thought the draw would be the preserve and the undeveloped parcel on the other side of the road. They put a hypothetical park space there, because there is a great view into Oak Creek Canyon, plus with the sidewalk connectivity and the Oak Creek pedestrian pathway, they thought that might be enough to cap off the Uptown area. Commissioner Taylor indicated that he would have placed more emphasis on that then, because it is a lovely spot and you really need a magnet there.

Chairman Gillon applauded their effort on sustainability and noted that the City and Planning & Zoning Commission are trying to bring the City more into the mode of dealing with sustainability, so and it was nice to see it coming from the applicant as well. There was one issue with height; you proposed a 3-story building and Sedona has a height limitation that makes it difficult to build three stories, unless you can build it into a hillside so the lower floors are within what the original grade would have been, or you could submerge the first floor. The only other alternative is to go for an exemption and you have to go through the Director who could be really nasty. Brandon indicated that possibly an onsite transfer of development rights would work, if we could highlight the

importance of preserving the natural corridor along Oak Creek, then perhaps an allowance for a 3-level building height would go through.

John O'Brien agreed with Commissioner Taylor and asked if retail really works there; it is kind of off the beaten path and you don't have a lot of retail, so there isn't a big draw. He and Nick met with the students and gave them Staff Reports from the last couple of projects on this property and they did a good job of addressing a lot of the issues. They have the 1-story lodging building on the highway, and we had talked about preserving the view of Snoopy Rock as you come into town. They also preserved the Jordan Wellhouse and made it a public feature, and then the 3-story lodging use allows them to preserve the Sycamores and not develop the hillside. They would have to go through a waiver process for that height waiver, but they have good arguments for that and they paid attention to the Main Street Guidelines. John O'Brien then asked if the park area along the creek would be open to the public, and if so, how about parking for that public area. Brandon indicated that it would be open to the public, and they would have to use the lovely pedestrian corridor and walk. John then asked if the park would still be owned by the property owner or would they dedicate it to the city. Brandon indicated they thought about dedication of both the preserve and the parcel on the other side of the highway, but they didn't look into it too much, so it was open for discussion. John indicated that overall all they listened to the issues, reviewed the documents and provided some affordable housing offsite.

The Chairman opened the public comment period.

Krista Cline, (role-playing the part of a concerned Sedona resident), Sedona, AZ: Indicated that her house has a view of the project in question, so she is concerned about this development proposal and brought an engineer with her as well. Her big concern is how this will impact her views. Her in-laws have been on that road for 40 years, and they all live next to each other and have tea on their back patio that faces that view every Sunday morning. That is one of their life quality aspects and if the economic situation got so bad that we had to sell their adjacent parcels, it would have a significant effect on their property values. She also didn't notice any participation notification signage on the property, so they should address how they can respond to citizen comments. Three stories in Sedona is unheard of and if they are going through a waiver or rezoning, just be aware it is a big issue. She also wants to know how they are going to handle ADA and the site grading to ensure that parking and all of those sidewalks are going to work. Those are her concerns and she is against this project.

The Chairman closed the public comment period.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:

Brandon Herman indicated that as far as the viewshed is concerned, by keeping the majority of the mature Sycamores onsite, that will reduce her eyesores, and regarding the parking, they don't have a Project Engineer present. The best way to answer that question is that the people who lived above her before she built her home were probably thinking the same thing about her house.

John O'Brien expressed his hope that this was a great exercise for the students; it is good experience to present to the Commission and have some questions asked of them. He didn't realize we were going to have a public plant, but that is good to have them react to, so hopefully, they got a lot out of the project. Chairman Gillon added that he hopes that between staff and NAU, we can invite next year's class to do this also.

No legal action was taken.

7. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and agenda items: (10 minutes 8:00 – 8:10)

Tuesday, May 18, 2010	– 3:30 p.m. – Regular
Thursday, May 27, 2010	– 3:30 p.m. – Work Session
Tuesday, June 1, 2010	– 5:30 p.m. – Regular

John O'Brien pointed out that on May 18th we have a Community Plan Update meeting at 3:30 p.m. in Chambers. June 1st will be the Falls at Oak Cree time extension, and also Nick will give a presentation on the Development Review process and how the introductory work session plugs into that, so he doesn't know if we need the May 27th work session. The Chairman also questioned the need for it. John added that we do have a couple of introductory items, but they could be added to the June 1st meeting; there is one for a small farmer's market and jeep tour area in Uptown that is a Conditional Use Permit, plus a renewal of the Conditional Use Permit for the Sedona Charter School on Kachina. The consensus of the Commission was to cancel the May 27th work session and add those items to the June 1st meeting.

8. Adjournment

Chairman Gillon called for adjournment at 8:11 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on May 4, 2010.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date